

Production
3. E. L. L. L. L.
DCI/IC 74-080
30 May 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Howard Stoertz,
NIO for Strategic Programs

SUBJECT: Experimental CIA-DIA Projections

Howie:

1. As you might expect from my long standing interest in the projection problem, I read the report on the experimental projection with great interest.
2. Most striking conclusion that I can draw is that the differences between CIA's and DIA's figures are trivial. DIA could accept CIA's figures with no problem to their consumers and CIA could accept DIA's figures with no problem for their consumers. I can think of no planning judgment in either the DOD or NSC arenas which would be significantly affected by the difference in the numbers as projected. I draw from this the conclusion that since DIA has to make these projections anyway, why not let them do it.
3. The man-hours to cross check the projections between the two agencies are peanuts compared to the man-hours involved for DIA in explaining their adherence in the past to two separate projections--one in the DIPP and one in the NIE. I, of course, agree that the man-hours required to coordinate a projection in a tougher area, say total reentry vehicles, would take more man-hours. But then it should, considering the impact of such projections.
4. The concepts of operational usage of weapons systems, i.e. FOXBAT with AWACS or FOXBAT without AWACS, are more important differences than the numbers. The place for solution of this kind of problem is in the text of national papers on the subject. From this I conclude that careful review of the textual material accompanying the DIPP projections is a more important monitoring function for the NIO (with CIA help) than is the number-by-number coordination of the tables.
5. I can only applaud the efforts that you are making to take care of this thorny problem of projections.

LTG Graham/we1

DIST:

Orig-Addee

① IC Registry

1-PRG

1-D/DCI/IC Chron

(Signed)
DANIEL O. GRAHAM, LTJG, USA

Daniel O. Graham
Lieutenant General, USA
D/DCI/IC